

### **REMARKS**

Reconsideration and allowance of the subject patent application are respectfully requested.

An Information Disclosure Statement (IDS) was filed on October 11, 2005. Applicants respectfully request that an initialed PTO-1449 form for this IDS be returned with the next office action.

The specification has been amended to correct minor informalities. Entry of these amendments to the specification is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-10<sup>1</sup> were rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 103(a) as allegedly being “obvious” over Taku (JP 2000-112435) in view of DeLange (U.S. Patent No. 5,719,593). While not acquiescing in this rejection, claims 1, 5, 6 and 10 have been amended and claims 4 and 9 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. The discussion below makes reference to the amended claims.

Claims 5 and 10 describe the writing of predetermined single color data, as a border line, on a border between a partial display area and the whole display area. In connection with the border, the office action identifies DeLange’s disclosure of a predetermined mixing area and references Figures 1 and 2 and col. 6, lines 8-38 in this regard. The referenced portions of DeLange describe mixing images (e.g., background and foreground images) in an edge area of the foreground image to achieve a transition between the background and foreground image. This mixing does not constitute the writing of predetermined single color data as claimed, nor is this mixing suggestive of the claimed writing of predetermined single color data as a border line. As described by way of example without limitation in the subject patent application, such a border line can improve display quality. See, e.g., pages 29-30; 32-34; and 40-41.

Because of the failure of Taku and DeLange to disclose or suggest the writing of predetermined single color data as claimed, claims 5 and 10 are believed to be allowable over the proposed combination of these applied documents.

---

<sup>1</sup> Although the statement of the rejection on page 2 of the office action only identifies claim 1 as being rejected, the discussion on page 4 mentions how certain features of claims 2-10 are allegedly provided by the proposed combination.

NAKANO et al.

Appl. No. 10/617,386

Response to Office Action dated September 16, 2005

Claims 1-3 depend from claim 5 and claims 6-8 depend from claim 10. These dependent claims are believed to be allowed over the applied documents because of these dependencies and because of the additional patentable features contained therein.


New claims 11-17 have been added. Claims 11-14 depend from claim 5 and claims 15-17 depend from claim 10. These dependent claims are believed to be allowed over the applied documents because of these dependencies and because of the additional patentable features contained therein.

The pending claims are believed to be allowable and favorable office action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

**NIXON & VANDERHYE P.C.**

By: \_\_\_\_\_

  
Michael J. Shea  
Reg. No. 34,725

MJS:mjs

901 North Glebe Road, 11th Floor

Arlington, VA 22203-1808

Telephone: (703) 816-4000

Facsimile: (703) 816-4100